

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claims 16, 19 and 20, claims 13 to 15, 18 and 21 to 25 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### II. Objection to Abstract

Regarding the objection to the Abstract, although this objection is not necessarily agreed with, the Abstract has been replaced with a new Abstract. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

### III. Objection to Claim 22

As regards the objection to Claim 22, the Examiner will note that the phrase “(d) the first plug-in connectors in arranged in a direction of gravity” has been changed to --(d) the first plug-in connectors are arranged in a direction of gravity” (emphasis added), thereby obviating this objection. As such, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### IV. Rejection of Claims 18 to 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 18 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. It is respectfully submitted that claims 18 to 20 are sufficiently definite for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action contends that lines 7 to 8 of claim 18 “are incorrectly expressed.” This contention cannot be understood. There is nothing apparently “incorrectly expressed” in lines 7 to 8 of claim 18.

Regarding the contention that claims 19 and 20 are improper, there is absolutely nothing indefinite with respect to the manner of expression of claims 19 and 20. All that is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) is that “[o]ne or more claims may be presented in dependent form, referring back to and further limiting another claim or claims in the same application.”

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 13 to 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) or 103(a)**

Claims 13 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,596,140 (“Walsh”) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Walsh and U.S. Patent No. 3,429,980 “Guttmann.” It is respectfully submitted that Walsh does not anticipate claims 13 to 25, and that the combination of Walsh and Guttmann does not render unpatentable the present claims, for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, claims 19 and 20 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot this rejection with respect to claims 19 and 20.

Regarding the remaining claims, the Examiner will initially note that claim 21 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite, *inter alia*, the features of claim 16. For example, claim 21 as amended recites that *the connection box has cable-feed openings on a lower side, the electronics insert is form-locked to the connection box, and the electronics insert is joined to an inner side of the hood to form a seal*. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 4, lines 5 to 8 and 23 to 27 and on page 8, lines 9 to 10 and 24 to 25 of the Specification, as well as in Figs. 2 and 4.

Neither Walsh nor Guttmann discloses, or even suggests, a connection box having cable-feed openings on a lower side. While pressure cap (46) and hermetic connector (52) of Walsh, which the Office Action considers to constitute a connection box, may have two openings, neither constitutes a cable-feed opening. One of the openings (50) is for purging the apparatus of Walsh with a dry gas, and the other opening is for accommodating a hermetic connector (52). While the apparatus of Guttmann may include a single opening (82) in a bottom plate (80) for passing wires (74) through to a mounting board (70) for electronic components (72), since the mounting board (70) of Guttmann would have to be removed from the housing (60) to replace or reconnect any of the wires (74) to the electronic components (72) on the mounting board (70), one skilled in the art would have no motivation to provide more than one hole in bottom plate (80) for passage of the wires (74).

In addition, neither Walsh nor Guttmann discloses, or even suggests, that an electronics insert is form-locked to the connection box. Circuit boards (12), resilient fingers (18) and terminator (54) of Walsh, which the Office Action considers to constitute an electronics insert, are slid into metal housing (42), and a threaded retainer ring (44) is screwed onto metal housing (42) and presses pressure cap (46) and a compression bellows (56) against the terminator (54). However, the terminator (54) of Walsh is in no manner form-locked to the bellows (56) or to the pressure cap (46). The mounting board (70) of Guttmann is slid into housing (60), and the bottom plate (80) is bonded to the housing (60), but the mounting board (70) is not form-locked to the bottom plate (80).

Furthermore, neither Walsh nor Guttmann discloses, or even suggests, that an electronics insert forms a seal with a hood. The circuit boards (12) of Walsh are slid into a cylinder (20), which is situated inside of metal housing (42). A sleeve (32) is situated between the cylinder (20) and the metal housing (42). Contrary to the contentions appearing on page 3, lines 8 to 9 of the Office Action, the sleeve (32) provides thermal insulation and shock absorption for the cylinder (20) (see column 2, lines 61 to 63 of Walsh) but does not seal the circuit boards (12) or the cylinder (20) to the metal housing (42). The mounting board (70) of Guttmann is slid into housing (60) and supported in housing (60) via channels (66). However, the mounting board (70) in no manner forms a seal with the housing (60).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is neither anticipated by Walsh nor rendered unpatentable by the combination of Walsh and Guttmann for at least these reasons.

As mentioned above, claim 16 has been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot this rejection with respect to claim 16.

As for claims 13 to 15, 17, 18 and 22 to 25, which ultimately depend from claim 21 and therefore include all of the features of claim 21, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13 to 15, 17, 18 and 22 to 25 are neither anticipated by Walsh nor rendered unpatentable by the combination of Walsh and Guttmann for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 21.

As regards claims 15 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are neither anticipated by Walsh nor rendered unpatentable by the combination of Walsh and Guttmann for the following additional reasons.

As regards claim 15, the thermally insulating sleeve (32) of Walsh that surrounds the circuit boards (12) and cylinder (20) prevents the metal housing (42) from acting as a heat sink or providing dissipation to the environment.

As regards claim 23, contrary to the contentions appearing on page 3, lines 6 to 7 of the Office Action, the end of the metal housing (42) of Walsh at which o-ring seal (48) is situated is not large enough to support a second seal. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to employ a second seal to seal the pressure cap (46) to the metal housing (42).

Accordingly, claims 15 and 23 are neither anticipated by Walsh nor rendered unpatentable by the combination of Walsh and Guttmann for these additional reasons.

In view of all of the foregoing, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **VI. Rejection of Claims 14 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Walsh and U.S. Patent No. 5,065,278 (“Schultz”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Walsh and Schultz does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 14 and 15 ultimately depend from claim 21 and therefore include all of the features of claim 21. As more fully set forth above, Walsh does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 21, from which claims 14 and 15 ultimately depend. Schultz does not cure the critical deficiencies of Walsh. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Walsh and Schultz does not render unpatentable claims 14 and 15, which ultimately depend from claim 21.

As for claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Walsh and Schultz does not render unpatentable this claim for the following additional reasons.

Even if the fins (50) of the housing portion (16) of Schultz were to be added to the metal housing (42) of Walsh, the thermal insulation properties of sleeve (32) of Walsh would prevent the metal housing (42) from serving as a heat sink or dissipating to an environment.

Accordingly, the combination of Walsh and Schultz does not render unpatentable claim 15 for these additional reasons.

In view of all of the foregoing, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**VII. Conclusion**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Clifford A. Ulrich  
Reg. No. 42,194

Date: June 4, 2008

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**